Machine Translated by Google

Un libro de filosofía para no filosofos que explica temas contemporaneos de la filosofia, con una prosa completamente atrapante y con un final inesperado.

HABLANDO CON EL MEJOR FILÓSOFO DEL PERÚ

¿PORQUÉ LA FILOSOFÍA ES OLVIDADA EN SOCIEDADES DONDE MÁS LA NECESITA?

Marco A Luna A

El libro aborda una conversación entre un profesor de filosofía y su alumno tocando temas muy profundos de la filosofía contemporanea

Machine Translated by Google

TALKING WITH THE BEST PHILOSOPHER OF PERU

Marco A Luna A

Machine Translated by Google

INTRODUCTION

At the crossroads between deep philosophical reflection and experience most intimate human, a dialogue develops that transcends the academic to enter the territories of freedom, truth and identity. This conversation, held between a student inquisitive and a skeptical but attentive teacher, he is not just a exchange of ideas, but a journey through time and thought: since Rousseau and his critique of democracy representative of the complexities of modern consciousness; from the foundations of morality to the tensions between scientific objectivity and the hidden interests of power.

But beyond the concepts and quotes, there lies a personal search. The shadow of a woman, her eyes and her gaze, act as a beacon that guides young Mark Antony in his attempt to reconcile the abstract truth with lived experience. Is freedom a Conscious choice or a conditioned illusion? Can truth be known without being betrayed by language? How is it related to the identity with the social and political structures that surround us?

These questions, although formulated in the field of philosophy, resonate at the heart of what it means to be human in a world fragmented. Through a dialogue that is both confrontational and complicity, this text explores not only the ideas, but also the silence that sustains them, the pain that motivates them and the hope of

Machine Translated by Google

that, behind the noise of words, something authentic can be found.

DEVELOPMENT

It was a quiet night, I had been through some tough times recently. I had realized that my emotions were altered and it was due to a sentimental problem, it was something that had always marked my life, but this time I had hit rock bottom, then I heard the voice of the nothing, she was speaking in public about emotional wounds, I had identified with her and listened to her disinterestedly, then I saw his black eyes look into mine, my body shuddered, My skin became like paper and I felt that she had something to teach me, I turned my gaze and couldn't get her black eyes out of my mind, she had A look as if God himself were looking at your soul, I hadn't noticed how beautiful she was, she had a small nose, an oval face and with perfect eyebrows, she was beautiful but she didn't try to be, she had the smile most beautiful I had ever seen but I didn't try to show it, she had the voice very delicate but it sounded strong, I left that place. That night I got to my room, I was tired, I opened my book, read a little and left to rest.

That night I had a strange dream, I saw myself as a warrior who escapes from a crowd of animal-men, all of them

Machine Translated by Google

Wanting to attack men, I joined several groups while
We were trying to climb buildings and hide and when they
We were marching to find the highest peak of all, on the way to the
highest peak we had to fight many times with those
animal-men, when we reached the top of a mountain there was a
giant wall, a few of us reached the top of the wall, but others
They wanted to keep fighting, so they came down from that wall, suddenly a
fight appeared between them, by then my body shone like
never and some wings appeared on my back, a woman who had already
seen on the top of the mountain appeared flying and approached the wall,
I continued watching as they fought and attacked those who wanted to get on the
top of the wall. when suddenly a fire started coming at everyone
We, the woman who had by then returned to battle,
I approached my already injured body, while the fire was spreading, I flew towards
her, I took her in my arms and walked away from the fire, then in the distance I saw a
giant tree, I headed towards that tree and got to the back and
I leaned my back against the tree, put her in front of me and hugged her, in that
At that moment I felt myself joining with her so that we were one,
then the explosion and the fire came, the tree surprisingly
stood still, when the fire destroyed everything, the time was
passing, you could see how the years passed like seconds, they passed
thousands of years, and new plants had already grown on the earth and there were
new vegetation. Suddenly in a very transparent vegetation she
She moved and separated from me, she was very thin, she looked at me straight in the face and
then he left as he disappeared into that wall from which we had

Machine Translated by Google

left, I on the other hand did not want to know anything about that fight, so
I was able to remember a past life, while my body also
faded, then I became a spirit a body of light without
It only forms a sphere of light, I remembered that he was a man from China
who had lived in prison for a long time and was now being
spirit, I could move just by thinking about that place, I had a
complete feeling of fullness, as I moved through that place, I saw
next to the tree from which I had come out, a small river and I saw a young man
coughing on the shore, I saw him from afar, not letting me see him.

That morning I woke up thinking about that dream, it was as if everything
I would have lived that for real, all day I thought about that dream.
Days passed and the dream had shown me something I couldn't do.
understand, then one of those many nights, I remembered that look,
in his eyes. And something told me I had to go back to that place, I couldn't
dream anything like that night, however, had changed
Something in me was the way I understood myself. That day I
I headed to where that young woman with the gaze of God was sitting.
on a bench with your eyes closed like someone who rests a little before
to continue, then I approached him and asked him, what was up with it
that I was talking about, she looked at me and told me it was about life, I felt a
chill that ran through my body, and I heard it that afternoon
long time, I said goodbye to her and came back the next day this time,
There were many more of us and whenever I looked at her I saw the
eyes of something higher that spoke to my conscience.

Machine Translated by Google

As the days went by, I attended classes after weeks of having
Ignored, however, by the influence of that young woman, I approached
more to my interior and this told me that I had to be more open with
the others, every morning I remembered their eyes and something in me changed,
I had become a different man thanks to her and I had
brought closer to the teachings of a living god.

That afternoon I returned to the classes I had left and saw something different in
A teacher was a philosopher who had never projected a defect on me
his in me, rather he was someone who did not inspire any judgment. I felt
a little familiarity with that form of human attitude, he was
Sitting reading a book, I approached him and asked him the title of the book.
book I was reading, he asked me to sit down and explained that book to me:

- The only thought in this book is human rights
universal and progressive around democracy,
methodological individualism as an anthropological principle,
complete secularization, that is, exclusion of all criteria
sacred or supernatural in the design of institutions
human, take the contingent values of the world of the
last 15 years (feminism, child sexuality, racial mixing
as "diversity", accept the shock of meaning that there are people
trans who needs to use the bathroom of their self-perceived sex, call

Machine Translated by Google

peace to war when it is under the control and interest of the "democracies") That is called unique because it does not admit the suspicion, nor the use of science, logic or social criticism.

And yes, it is about betting on the return of metaphysics and religion. as organizing principles of the violent chaos of Gestell or "Single thought", cause of so much death and destruction in the universe

I remained silent and had a small slip of that word very deep that Gestell sounded, I remembered with an example what meant; A virgin forest ceases to be seen as a living place and sacred, and under the Gestell, it becomes “furniture and wood”.

I remained silent for a moment, hesitated a little, and said:

- I was working on finding moral intuitions, they wouldn't be religious but it would be something metaphysical. So we remove the bias of dogma and is accepted as a new form of morality. The The problem is the perceived freedom of people, they are free of what they want to do, think or feel. Then we would have to add a new concept or justification of freedom without associate ourselves with a social explanation of this freedom, so as not to make it unnecessarily complex. And this justification or concept of freedom can be harmonized with these moral intuitions.

He said nothing for a few minutes, closed his book and paid attention to what was happening. that he said:

Machine Translated by Google

- I don't think freedom is a clear concept.
enough to explain anything. Only 200 years ago, no one
He spoke of "freedom" and the philosophical tradition never believed that
"being free" had moral value. That was until they invented the
word the English, who immediately subdued the peoples
in his name and created the British Empire.

I was thinking about what he said I really wasn't focused on
that specific topic and I remembered what that mysterious woman said
woman, “We lose freedom when we lose ourselves
“themselves”, I related this term and said without hesitation:

- Freedom is something metaphysical of the same consciousness as a basis
even.

He remained calm but looked at the floor and then shook his head.
saying:

- If that were true, all people would have believed that
"Freedom" is something moral. The historical truth is that no one
people at no time in human history have believed
never in freedom until the philosophers invented it
Scots, that is, the founders of capitalism.

I remained silent because the truth that I told him was much
more general than he had understood, I remained silent and he
He continued speaking:

- Freedom is a liberal capitalist value and is contingent. In the
to the extent that it conflicts with more moral beliefs

Machine Translated by Google

fundamental, freedom is even an obstacle to carrying

a dignified and meaningful human life.

I remained silent, because the type of truth that we were

speaking was not compatible with the truth that I was mentioning,

Suddenly one of his students appeared, he approached and greeted us.

Both approached the other side of the professor and asked him about some

work that he had left in his class, he kept chatting with him

for a few minutes, giving him step-by-step guidance on what he had to do

to do. I looked ahead and remembered those eyes that had

touched my soul. Suddenly I felt someone stand up and

farewell, he said goodbye to the professor with a handshake of those

that are given when closing a sale and brought his hand closer to where I was,

Suddenly when I was raising my hand the teacher

I asked him what he knew about freedom, he stopped and I was left with the

hand half raised however, I brought it towards him and he received

the greeting, he stood for a long time and mentioned that:

- Freedom was invented at the time of the French Revolution.

The professor remained calm but stated that:

- No. The concept of "freedom" comes from the English and from there it goes

to France with The Social Contract, a rather bad essay book

which became widely read around 1870.

He kept thinking, he didn't say anything but, he had this feeling that

should not be silent, I noticed how a nervous look was born from his

eyes, a few seconds passed in silence and he mentioned:

- Are you referring to the essay that Rousseau wrote for a competition?

Machine Translated by Google

Teacher

- That same Rousseau was highly appreciated for his genre of writing. His complete works published under Napoleon They added up to 22 volumes if I'm not mistaken. In 1770, no one was It happened that he would end up becoming the spiritual leader of the "Jacobins" (by Juan-Jacobo), miserable murderers.

I knew that Rousseau had written two books for the same contest in different years, but the most famous was “Speeches on The origin and foundations of inequality among men” A essay that I had presented in previous years, although my memory was brilliant, I knew I couldn't trust her completely. After After a few seconds of silence the teacher continued mentioning.

- In Spanish his works were unknown until the Napoleonic Wars, in which translations were made as part of the ideological campaign of the French, before 1812 it was necessary read it in French, as did the liberal courtiers who They betrayed the King in favor of the Antichrist.

I understood a little history and knew that the French liberals They promoted their ideas throughout Europe and when they arrived in Spain, they were considered an ideology of the antichrist. I kept quiet while I wanted to understand that teacher, when I heard that his student, he replied.

- Always so controversial our friend Rousseau, since his Emile, or his works under Napoleon's boots.

Machine Translated by Google

The teacher nodded and continued.

mentioning.

- In the Revolution he was taken as an ideologist. The countries of French influence based their political regimes on the basis of his ideas, which sadly are somewhat contradictory and more rhetorical than conceptual. The point is that contractualism, which came from the English, became a fashionable theory. Rousseau He expressed these ideas in beautiful, elegant French.

I understood what he meant, I had known about the contractualists previous years and were the main theorists who spoke of a justification of a state with ideas about the state of nature in the human being, that is, what the human being was like without society. and understood that These ideas were expanding to speak globally about the concept of freedom.

The teacher remained silent, then found a silence uncomfortable and mentioned:

- If our country has failed so much, a good dose of failure It comes from having spread Rousseau during the civil war (1814-1826)

I settled down a little, leaning my back behind both of them, Professor mentioned that, because the founding of a republic is inspired by Rousseau's ideas such as popular sovereignty, social contract and freedom, equality and the general will. No

Machine Translated by Google

He stopped to teach a little history while I stretched my legs.
He mentioned his students:

- In the 17th and 19th centuries it was appreciated by Emilio. In this century also for his essays on inequality and the noble savage, another outdated idea that Rousseau did not create, but rather took from other authors less fortunate in the art of writing.

When I had studied Rousseau I had understood that the idea of man in the state of nature was brilliant and very profound, which did not I was only talking about a good-natured wild man, but not a man who He knew himself through others, like a mirror, and that is why he never would hurt himself. When I returned to my original position his student told me looked, and answered:

- In Dickens's A Tale of Two Cities, that is very noticeable. aspect, the tension that the English had embedded in France It was such that the Revolution is not on the part of the people but on the part of the influence of the bourgeoisie.

I understood a little of what they were talking about, I kept quiet and watched In front of a cathedral, with a dome that resembled the temple itself Where she spoke, I suddenly felt like her student loved me reach out, I briefly took his hand to say goodbye and the teacher asked me:

- You believe in freedom.

Machine Translated by Google

I was silent for a long time, maybe that was the reason why
We were returning to that topic, I understood that I had to speak sincerely,
then I said:

- Hesitating before acting is a manifestation of freedom.
that freedom is awareness of something, in this case of an action,
just as guilt or regret constitute a process
conscious of morality, that is, I cannot feel guilty if I think that
I don't act freely, even if I do I decide to think it wasn't
free or be aware that maybe I wasn't aware and not feel
guilt, in that case there is also a process of choice. Between the
There is a very diffuse gap between academicizing and experimenting,
as in Heidegger specifically for this case. Because
I can do a morally correct action because the law requires it of me and
I can do the same moral action because I feel it is the
correct regardless of what the law tells me.
Each town had a certain morality because it is itself
daughter of her time and custom, whether by law or by feeling.
But the process of manifesting freedom by stopping and
Reflecting on an action, even not doing it, is a process
of freedom or choice, related to morality.
Well, the deep thing here is to study those processes.
unaware of why we choose a moral action without it being
written in a law, or the process of doubt, also guilt and

Machine Translated by Google

repentance. And relate it to a theory of identity
to then move on to the study of the social.

He thought about what I said, he didn't respond in any way,
I look ahead and then settle down at that moment I was
about to say goodbye, it was normal that no one would listen to very bad things
diverse that find a symbiosis to prove a point. When
I was about to say goodbye, about to get up, he asked me:

- And what do you know about Rousseau?

I didn't understand the abrupt change of the question, it was an answer that
I didn't expect it, in fact I thought that everything I had said before wasn't
had no validity, I settled into the seat dilating my
muscles and said:

- Regarding Rousseau, he did not believe in democracy.
representative, that is why in the time of Napoleon they were treated as
citizens among themselves, that is why Rousseau believed in democracy as
political body. And Rousseau was very interesting because he went in
against the upper classes of his time, where humanism was
as the improvement of the human being, but society lived in
appearances and superficialities and this for Rousseau was a
failure in human progress, then makes the analysis of the
origin of inequalities in man and mentions that the
Man is free, self-sufficient and peaceful where the law rules
compassion and love itself, then differentiate it with love
own that arises in society, for this reason he mentions that the

Machine Translated by Google

societies corrupt man. So there are two kinds of inequalities: natural (strength, age, etc.) and moral (prestige, power etc) that are unfair. Where through pacts Deceptive, the rich convince the poor to accept the laws and governments. Thus, the origin of inequality occurs with the property, when the first man says this is mine and convinces to others to believe and accept that. And of course the civil society and with that the origin of inequalities. So This resonated with the bourgeoisie who were poor trying to be rich, and naturally the discourse evolved as a process of freedom by rejecting courts and kings and that we are all equal and free. To this day, but they forget the Rousseau's democracy, which did not believe in democracy representative. Because this already constitutes a contradiction of equality and freedom.

The teacher listened to me attentively, I listened to him with interest, it was a one of the first times that a superior felt interest in what I said, I settled down and it seemed curious to me, then I had like a impulse that came from within, I remembered that woman and the things that professed, I couldn't stop seeing his eyes in my mind, it was something completely new to me. It was like I was coming back to life. I felt a subtle joy that was born in my heart. Then he stepped back At my level at the back of the bench he settled into his position original and I did the same thing and he said:

Machine Translated by Google

- Hesitating before putting a spoonful in your mouth during the

Lunch is an act of freedom, until the 18th century it was said "free will", not by coercion, for example torture where an evil weevil would force me to eat. Yes, that's freedom. But there is nothing moral about it, nor even anything rational. A rat that hesitates before biting into a piece of garbage also hesitates, with any reason. We are aware of doubting, for example, whether the cook wants to poison me, but in general the conscience and the freedom have no relationship. Saint Augustine had consciousness, in fact he created the word "cogito" to express that, but I believed that doubts like those noted were false problems and did not affect the free will of man, a anthropological condition and never a moral concept.

I understood what he meant, but something in me knew he was right, I knew that there were things that I possibly had to comment on, so when I was about to answer when he mentioned:

- Doing the right things because the law requires it is something that left the normativists who lead us to world war nuclear in the name of rules like democracy, which so profitable is to the companies of the Military Industrial Complex of USA.

Rousseau did not believe in representative democracy. That Such a regrettable concept was invented by John Stuart Mill.

Machine Translated by Google

I kept quiet, but I knew that Stuart Mill refined the concept of representative democracy, but that Rousseau really did not believe in a representative democracy, I did not believe it because this was contradictory, because if we have to choose a few to govern, we lose our equality, and if we let a few govern then we lose our freedom. I kept quiet about this but I wanted to reflect on freedom, because I thought that I hadn't explained myself well, so I said:

- **Doubting whether you are eating out of gluttony, anxiety, hunger, fear is a principle of freedom because you are looking for the origin of your actions and depending on the origins you will feel guilty or not, that then it will be categorized as correct or incorrect. But the thing about Rousseau yes, I can't help but comment that it is a concept today more than ever relevant, today we do not need corrupt congressmen or clowns allied with the dark ones, we Through our cell phones we can vote on the laws that affect us. to rule and that in this way a new nation is created with a real democracy, for better or worse instead of waiting for Congressmen do politics in the name of the people who do not represent, if everyone is in Lima and comes twice a year.**

He nodded, he was thinking about what he had said, he passed about 30 seconds and said:

- **About democracy... Well, we've been doing the same thing for 200 years now. and things couldn't be worse for us. However, since this is not a philosophical concept but a belief, is respected**

Machine Translated by Google

I understood that he mentioned that democracy was a very
recent but was not considered philosophical, however, this
concept came from a much deeper concept and that concept
It was freedom then I said:

- What I'm saying is that freedom is not a concept, it's a fact,
That is why at the beginning I separated the academic from the experiential, with
He stated that it is not an acronym, it is realizing something that
It was always there, because in the Middle Ages the 7 deadly sins
They were demons that were incarnated in one and for that reason they had
men not free from those sins, and in Greece the knowledge
of himself was something important because it was so important that
in his temple they highlighted it, reasoning does not work well without
data or reflection and these are always changing but there are
ideas like freedom that were always with others
names, with other meanings and so on. That's why he mentioned
before it was a delicate subject, in the book about the soul of
Aristotle distinguishes that specifically what he calls appetites that
share the sensitive soul, between men and animals, then
the human being having only one soul but that is divided into
levels so to speak, you can confuse him that way, the
The level of rational soul that the human being is in is what makes him
distinguishes animals and plants, although they share the soul
vegetative.

Then I took a breath and continued:

Machine Translated by Google

- Then we cannot compare animals and men. Everything is philosophy, an indigenous concept that no one knows and describes a specific way of seeing reality, it is philosophy if I could not saying is only legitimate knowledge if it is in the dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy, and concepts such as Gestell and Vorhandenheit, they would not be legitimate knowledge, the same would have happened when the texts of Aristotle and Plato brought by the Arabs, in the worst case, every philosophical concept new was first personal and then justified with concepts older and that's not a bad thing for most but For me yes, because it generates a never-ending theoretical framework. without investigating original principles that would be the basis not for put something on top (theories and concepts) if not to understand the reality or realities and experience them. Democracy, plutocracy, aristocracy, are forms of government that the Greeks used then must have something philosophical. How It has evolved and ended up being what it is, it is something else, but Putting it back on the table and rethinking it must be philosophy specifically to those who like political philosophy.

He remained calm, but there was something in his eyes, that fire of no agree, when I saw I said I had to stop mentally,

So I settled down on that bench trying to calm my muscles, when suddenly in a rather serious tone he said to me:

- Dear Marco Antonio. When someone says, to put it mildly, case, that the fight for LGBT "rights" is not a concept

Machine Translated by Google

but a fact", that person is wrong and incurs anachronism. There were no "rights" before 1789, nor were there "LGBT groups" until American corporations banned them invented as a way to reduce and control the population. In the Middle Ages, Asians bought European children for sodomize them and in Rome there were "LGBT" orgies of various kinds. So "reasoning doesn't work well without data." In my examples, in fact, there was general homosexuality from the Antiquity. But there were no "rights" nor were there "LGBT" for more That's the only thing you see on television and that I never saw from 1964 to 2015, precisely because it did not exist.

I was shocked because I had to find a concept that would would allow us to explain that concepts are human creations and therefore They are both ideas that arise from consciousness and by not being studied depth we should not think that concepts always have that are historical. While I was thinking about what to say, the professor continued saying:

- **"Everything is philosophy" but there must first be internal justifications of the philosophical tradition and some social needs also the compliance with certain historical and logical criteria, which only some widespread beliefs, such as that we are all equal or that LGBT is a moral option that builds the being human are something closer to psychiatry, ignorance, reflexivity or lack of critical spirit.**

Machine Translated by Google

When he had finished speaking, he remained silent for a few moments.
seconds while I was putting my thoughts in order and he mentioned that:

- **Neanderthals had fears, anxieties, anger,**
  passions, hunger and could never be free. Nor are they
  dogs or cows, which suffer the same internal states.
  No one can be or not be what in his own conscience he does not
  It exists. That doesn't change just because the ideologist thinks so today.
  American Judith Butler or have financed it with thousands of
  millions of dollars from the United States so that people like you
  or I don't have children and define our lives by our
  sexual activities, something that not even animals do.

I kept thinking about what he said about consciousness, "No one
may or may not be what does not exist in one's own consciousness" and of course
I understood that a person cannot speak of freedom if in his reality
It is irrelevant whether you are free or not. Then in a calmer voice he
I settled down and said:

- **Heidegger's concepts are not in the RAE. It seems to me**
  Very well, because they are German terms that only the
  Spanish speakers should know if it is the case that they are
  professionals in philosophy.
- **Si non est philosophi, cuius alterius veritatem vel falsitatem esse**
  iudicium, which means If the judgment on the matter is not the philosopher's
  truth or falsehood of something, whose else it is

Machine Translated by Google

I had never heard that term in Latin, it was something new to me, but I understood what he meant. Then he continued saying:

- Will George Soros, the CEO of Vanguard, think the truth? BlackRock, which promoted and financed the war in Ukraine, will think to seize natural resources and make investments in reconstruction? I'm happy if you think about the truth yourself. same.

At that point I had already spent a lot of time talking with That teacher, however, had empty fields in what I mentioned, one of them was about Judith Butler, who did not use the philosophical tradition to talk about LGBT rights but in its beginnings I wanted to give it a new focus on the philosophy of language, in In this case, to the speech acts, where she would mention that some terms create roles in society and machismo is perpetuated, and that justified a gender identity based on the constructions of speech acts, and of course this was very revolutionary and led to There will be many ideological things discussed, however, she reflected a problem in society regarding its creation with speech acts.

I remembered a good teacher who told me that performative acts have a causal link with reality, where if they say "I promise I will come tomorrow" and you actually keep your promise is a performative act, But the interesting thing about this is that language not only describes the reality but makes it.

Machine Translated by Google

When he remained silent, I felt this impulse that I had to speak, I had to say something extremely important, so that I could be understand correctly what I was thinking, but something crossed my mind my head and said it without thinking too much:

- **Always when they say "dear Marco Antonio I have to stop", it's funny. The truth is much more than concepts, prejudices, theories, discovery of new concepts, the Truth is much more than any form of perception of the world and its successes and failures, the truth is what it is, what always was and always will be. And every philosopher who knows the true, I try to explain it but the limit is present in us as outside of us, only the experience of the truth is paradoxically a way of explaining it.**

Until this moment I didn't know how to articulate what I had understood. of the professor, however, it was something that in a general framework took sense in my mind, so I said to him in a doubtful tone:

- **"No one can be and not be what in his own conscience he does not exists" that is, identity requires reflective consciousness, so so much so that Americans impose a cultural agenda that diverts people of their biological identity? Don't animals create a cultural or existential identity? If the philosopher renounces that function referring to its Latin phrase, of having a judgment on the**

Machine Translated by Google

Is it true that culture will be at the mercy of American interests? And your

What is the truth in this case, biological identity?

Until that moment that was what I understood from the things that the teacher
I was saying. But I just finished speaking with a phrase that seemed to me
appropriate in the context we were in:

- If so, it is not the truth, it is the opposite. Because it requires something and
the truth requires nothing more than itself.

By this time I was completely immersed in the
conversation, but that was not all, it had to go further
to delve deeper into the truth, the one that he had experienced and with the
As time went by and situations had darkened, I remembered his eyes
As I settled in silence, I saw her, complete in her eyes, she
had led me to remember the truth and trust it no matter what the
people did not know her or have the understanding to know her.
Then he looked at me, and I could see that the truth he spoke of,
emerged in his gaze. He looked around the park on a sunny day
taking refuge in the shade of a tree, he said:

- The truth of the 21st century is not eternal, philosophy is not a
religion, nor a catechism, nor an ideology, but a way of
life based on interest in the truth.

At that moment I understood the situation, it was something that was usual
there was experiment, it was everything I had known before, but
Looking at him closely I understood that something bigger was being talked about
then I went on and said:

Machine Translated by Google

- I just don't want people to think that the truth is religious, it's a mistake to think that what cannot be described is religion or belief. But it is the beginning of the study of the origin of the understanding, with Kant, Heidegger, Husserl. If we do not know the origin of understanding which is the first manifestation of truth (which is the last but not the only thing that can be understood) up to now), there will be conflict because if you don't think about it that I think or believe what I believe, those thoughts and beliefs are will become the source of conflicts, whether social, personal or politicians.

My position was clear, and my eyes were emitting the look of that woman. Then the professor said:

- Okay. But you don't think I "think what I think." And what cannot be described (known) is, in effect, religion or belief, that is, something superior and more certain than any science that have invented the moderns.

I remained silent for a few seconds, then took a breath and replied:

- There is a difference here, what is known and what cannot be known. describe, is different from what cannot be described and is not can know. This difference is important because this is useful of justification for the truth, A truth that goes beyond the time (of the truth of the 21st century), because time is time of something in a consciousness that we can understand but not describe or explain, and if we do not do that (the study of the origin of understanding and that specific distinction), the truth is

Machine Translated by Google

a truth of its time returns (journalistic truth, truth
ideological etc, even a personal truth of believing that you think
What you think is something I cannot describe or know, and this
be something true), but the truth itself is a truth that goes
beyond, of the description because it is known. And as you know
something without describing it? Here begins the study of the origin of the
understanding and of course it is more true than any science that is
It is invented by the very fact that it has not been invented but
what is it.

Then I understood that maybe we wouldn't be able to understand each other and that it was better to continue my day, without intervening further, then he mentioned:

- **I stopped talking in terms of "consciousness" around 1984.**
  Since then I don't understand what it is to be aware of something and,
  Personally, I don't think I have anything that is a "conscience".
  The only truth in itself is God. "Describe," he thought
  Heidegger, it is perhaps the last thing we do when we know
  something. I know the Anglos believe otherwise, but they are the ones who
  They destroy the Earth. They destroy it precisely because it
  They describe it but do not understand it. They are like a child who is
  gives him a treasure to play with.

Quickly mention:

- **It's incredible because that's where the difference begins when we have**
  awareness of something, we have understanding of something and description
  of that something, but consciousness and essence are the same. Then the
  The big question is, what is consciousness like and what is consciousness like?

Machine Translated by Google

of something, be it at the same time as not? If there were not something in means that creates that difference. But what, how and when.

But before that we have to understand and resolve that the Truth is not understood, it is experienced and therefore known, but the first manifestation or after knowing is the understanding the truth. Solving this is key to continuing

continue saying:

- Honestly, I don't mind looking bad, I've been doing it for a long time. But I would like to finish the idea because I felt that he understood it.

He looked at me and said:

- We can use an AI to see if what you say makes sense or not.

do you have it?

I nodded, then he handed me his cell phone with a AI platform already programmed to do the same thing I said Before, try to make the effort to clearly define the ideas you are putting it on the cell phone, suddenly in less than a minute there was already a answer with titles and subtitles, then hand over your cell phone, and the He began to read it calmly. The result was something like this:

1. Where the difference begins:

"When we are aware of something, we have understanding of something and description of that something."

Here you state that:

Machine Translated by Google

To be aware of something (to realize something),

leads to having an understanding of it (understanding it),

and then a description (put it into words).

That is to say: there is a chain:

Awareness of something ÿ Understanding ÿ Description

So far everything seems logical.

2. But then you make a break: consciousness and essence are the same thing

"...but consciousness and essence are the same."

This breaks the previous chain, because you introduce a new truth.
deep:

Consciousness does not just observe something external, but is the essence
same.

That is, there is no separate "conscious self" and "something outside": the
Consciousness is being itself, not just the perception of something.

Machine Translated by Google

Here you are touching on a powerful philosophical intuition (similar to certain ideas of Husserl, Advaita, or mysticism):

Consciousness is not a function of the mind, it is the very foundation of being.

ÿ **3. Then comes the big question:**

"How is consciousness and how is consciousness of something, be it at the same time time, of course? If there weren't something in between that created that difference."

This is key.

You are asking:

If consciousness is the essence, how can it also be “consciousness of”? something"?

Because "being aware of something" implies a separation: there is an "I" that perceives and a "something" that is perceived.

Then a paradox arises:

How can consciousness be one (pure essence) and at the same time time two (awareness of something)?

Machine Translated by Google

You sense that:

There must be something in between that creates that difference.

A kind of bridge, veil or mechanism that allows one to experience as duality.

But you ask yourself:

What is it? How does it appear? When does it arise?

And that opens the door to a deeper study of the origin of the understanding and the structure of consciousness.

4. Before resolving this paradox, you raise a necessary basis:

"We have to understand and resolve that the truth is not understood, it is experiences, and thereby is known."

Here you reaffirm your central idea:

Truth is not something that can be understood with thought.

It is not reached through explanations, ideas, or descriptions.

Machine Translated by Google

The truth is lived, it is experienced directly, and that is why it is known.

(not by deduction, but by direct contact).

5. But then you introduce a crucial nuance:

"...but the first manifestation (or after knowing) is the

understanding of the truth."

So you say:

Although the truth is not understood first,

Once lived or known, the first thing that appears as a reflection is the

comprehension.

This understanding after direct experience is not the

truth itself, but it is like its echo in the mind.

It's as if you were looking at the sun head on (direct experience),

and then you saw the light reflected in the water (understanding).

6. Why is this key to continue?

"Resolving this is key to moving forward."

Because if we don't understand this difference:

Machine Translated by Google

We will continue to confuse understanding with truth itself.

Or believing that having correct ideas is the same as having known the truth.

And you're saying:

No. That's a mistake.

Only when this distinction is recognized—and the experience is lived straight from the truth—

one can begin to see how duality arises,

how consciousness "is" and "is of something" at the same time,

and what is the "something" that creates that apparent separation.

ÿ **CONCLUSION EXPLAINED WITH ALL OF THE ABOVE:**

At first, it seems that:

Being aware ÿ leads to understanding ÿ leads to description.

But you say this is not enough.

Because consciousness is not just an observer, but the very essence.

So you ask yourself:

How can consciousness be “one” and also “consciousness of something”?

Machine Translated by Google

And you conclude that:

There must be something in between that creates that difference between unity and duality.

But before studying that, you need to understand:

The truth is not understood, it is experienced.
And only after knowing it, understanding appears as its reflection.

That understanding is not the truth, but it is the first manifestation of having lived it.

I remained silent as he read the entire generated response,
Then I began to look at that cathedral, and its bell that was
moved and with it a sound that expanded, we had already been more
After 3 hours on that bench, he turned off, blocked his cell phone and told me that I would have to go to lunch and that it is not a bother that I accompanied, then I answered truthfully that I had not problem, we got up from that bench and walked to a restaurant section that was at the university, then he I asked about his classes and if I didn't have any more classes after talking for more than three hours, he replied that this day his work I finished at 9:00 am, where I had a class at 6:00 pm and that was

Machine Translated by Google

It would be preferable that he didn't leave university because he wouldn't have much sense to go home to return. In the city we were in traffic was known to be some of the worst in the world, while I thought about it and remembered those eyes and the fire they emitted, made in the afternoon almost to dusk was where she went out to talk to the others.

I was thinking about her, when suddenly we came to a super elegant restaurant, it was a place where teachers and administrative staff enjoyed their food, greeting everyone and I did the same, we went up to a terrace where you could see the whole campus the sun was above our heads and it was a very sunny day.

So we ordered something to eat and we didn't talk about anything personal, nor Nothing like what we were talking about before, we were just enjoying ourselves the food, while the sun advanced, at the end of eating I took out the cell phone and 28 minutes had passed, of being seated. That moment of silence was important to understand my current situation in the institution, I had never been aware of people's prejudice against that in me I had already eliminated prejudice, however, I thought that that did not cease to exist, I wondered if the other teachers of previous years would understand what I was saying or in the project that I wanted to do, suddenly a flashback came to my mind:

Machine Translated by Google

I was in the classroom of a teacher who didn't understand the reasons and reflections on the why of things, rather the classes were instructions without reflection on the things that were being done, where every question that was asked was forbidden, I spent a lot of time time in that place with that teacher where the things that I honestly wanted to know, I couldn't learn them from him. Although I also sporadically had very good teachers but They were only at university for a short time. I couldn't develop myself. as I wanted, in fact I had a lot of conflict before I started study, but I always felt guided as if in perfect time was living.

While I remembered all of college life, and didn't know how I was going to After finishing my studies, I heard the teacher say that if I could explain to him better than what I had said. Then I settled down and said:

- You may know how to play like Beethoven but you can't understand what Beethoven feels when playing the same piece, happens The same with the truth, you can know the truth but not the You can describe, but you can understand what it is like. know the truth. When you know the truth.

Generally speaking, when you don't know the truth, the following happens: On the contrary, you believe that you can know and understand the truth, with alone, in our case understanding the deepest themes of the philosophy, in other cases looking for the most journalistic facts

Machine Translated by Google

reliable, or in common terms seeking what is most in line with
the facts in a specific situation, imitating well
Beethoven, that is, being aware of something, and this is when
destroys. While consciousness itself, which is the essence
acts by itself, that is why the truth is and will be. And he who
Knowing the truth, act according to the truth, not according to
the awareness of something, that is why I mentioned that there was a
difference and that by studying that difference I had to start the
study of the origin of understanding, and which is not at all religious
but purely philosophical, you mention that when the
They describe it, they don't understand it and when they describe it, they destroy it.
mentioning Heidegger, that is at the level of separation,
of the one who does not know the truth, but the one who knows the truth does not know it.
describes nor destroys it because that is impossible, but it is
separates from it, then every time it is described it only goes away
Putting together a small piece of a huge puzzle, we have
Heidegger, Kant, Husserl, who were putting together that
puzzle. That's why I mentioned at the beginning that philosophy is a
expansion of consciousness, every philosopher who knew the truth goes
putting a little piece into that puzzle. You can't
Describe the puzzle because it has not been completed, but it is
knows the truth, that is, the framework and what is missing and places the piece.
It is true that every philosopher has his own interests, but a
Kant, a Heidegger, a Huserl are part of something much more
great. Because after the truth, you have a life, a

Machine Translated by Google

responsibility and each one developed it according to his/her context.

He remained silent and looked around, then to the side
Ours had a viewpoint, with benches like the ones we were on before,
So we got up and went to sit there, the place was spacious
and had a roof made of wood that provided shade to the whole
viewpoint. I placed my briefcase on the side of the bench and watched as the
The sun was shining brightly, then I heard him say:

- **"Being aware of something" is not a technical expression, but a everyday way of speaking, which is why the whole of the argument is invalid, I still love what you say. You're going to be a good philosopher.**

I listened to him and didn't want to answer, it was as if all I had
said made sense but it was not a technical language, so I
I remained silent, while we watched a group of young people
entering with protest signs and dispersing throughout the university
He told me that it was better to go, that maybe they will close the shop soon.
university, then we took our things and said goodbye.

That afternoon I wanted to tell him that instead of being aware of something, it would be better
use intentionality, a term from Aristotle to refer to that which
the mind can receive information about something without the matter being there,
Later, scholastics like Saint Thomas took the idea
as a concept, where they said the same thing, but specifying the

Machine Translated by Google

separation of a “knower” from the known. And later
Philosophers like Husserl refer to it as all consciousness is
consciousness of something because it is always referred to an object whether real or
imaginary. However, there was no opportunity to continue
Speaking, that day I didn't go to classes, it had already been time to enter
some class, that afternoon I went to where she was speaking, I put on
on some benches waiting for her but that day she didn't show up, I returned home
a little confused, but I had that feeling of knowing she would come back
morning. The next day I hoped to see her again, so
went to college where he had a full day of classes, then
I attended my classes that day just before 4:00 pm I left and went out
looking to see her again. On the way to that place I thought about the
classes I was attending, I hadn't learned anything new, it was
rather a review of everything I already knew, at that time the
Financial need was not a priority in my life, I did not pay attention to it.
attention and I would surely do well in whatever I dedicated myself to.

When I arrived at that place in front of the temple, I didn't see her again, it was
Something strange and a feeling of emptiness was already in me. I returned home
and I couldn't help but go over some of the classes I had to take again.
tomorrow with the teacher.

That morning I woke up with a heaviness that covered my entire being,
I quickly did my exercises and practices to raise my vibration,
When I finished, I got my things ready and went to classes, the previous days I didn't

Machine Translated by Google

I had attended classes, for different reasons and one of them was that I was programming different platforms or learning from programming, it had been a long time since I went to classes and That was a problem for my development, however that woman had put on me, something I couldn't explain, but it made me feel balanced. That morning I wanted to see her, and talk to her, so that I got ready to stay late.

That day the classes were normal, the same as always, topics that already I had studied, I didn't have any friends at the university, I was completely alone and it didn't bother me always thinking that if you have family you don't need friends, but that time I was alone in That city, although I spoke to them frequently, was not the same ideal, however, I sensed that I had to do programming. While thinking about that and the things I had to do at home finish classes. That teacher I had spoken to came in, He greeted everyone and started his classes and suddenly began to talk about the conversation we had, on that occasion I was shocked because I thought we would never talk about it again. Then I asked:

- Know the concept of intentionality?

I raised my voice and told him that I did know him, he replied because So I hadn't mentioned it before, so I said:

Machine Translated by Google

- I have been able to use the concept of intentionality, but that is not would have stood out and made it difficult to understand the difference that I mentioned before and that never ends up being educated intelligence because there will always be a new language, a new career, a new skill, but you have to go using intelligence as a bridge to intellectual intuition. It's like in your book intelligence would be the light and shadow would be Intellectual intuition, the light illuminates everything knowing everything, and the shadow is seeing what intelligence is not seeing illuminating.

At that moment I no longer wanted to participate in the class, in fact that always the problem with the other teachers I had, and this was already coming Since I was a child, I honestly wanted to know those things that I asked and yet everyone except for 3 the whole time studying, he had listened to me completely in everything that I wanted to say, and by then it was already in vain to say things, in my Mind you the conversation was already over and there was nothing more to do speaking, when suddenly the teacher says:

- In my book it's different. You try to follow a proposal. epistemological. I have given you my opinion on epistemology as something that closed its cycle around 1960. If epistemology exists for similar reasons as "trans people" and LGBT. There is no basis for either one or the other. except for the political interest of a certain decadent country that invests billions trying to get us to think about witches.

Machine Translated by Google

The tone was different, it was a more formal tone, surely because We were with more people and the answers had to be made that way. Then he continued:

- My book deals with a relatively phenomenological question. thought of the world as a whole and also deals with the metapolitics. To a lesser extent, it holds a mystical vision that is follows from the above.

Still, despite everything I have written to you, have no doubt that I admire his work, his tenacity and his imagination. In philosophy That's important and you have your whole life ahead of you. If After the nuclear war you manage to survive, it is possible Let epistemology be reborn. It is essential for the fourth war nuclear that was to be unleashed one day.

At that moment I had to keep quiet, it was clear that I was not going to to answer, then the silence did not have to be prolonged then mentioned:

- There is no violence without the cult of science, that is, subordination from human beings to their own products. However, the Violence as an impulse is something innate to man and is It is even natural that there are philosophies that camouflage and justify it. in its worst expressions. It is perhaps the destiny of Man destroy that from which it came. Science and epistemology are the basic tool to achieve this.

Machine Translated by Google

Then he continued with the various tasks we had to perform for the
The following week, after an hour talking about epistemology, he
He said goodbye and left class early, I got my things ready, while everyone
They were leaving the room, at that moment when I remained silent, everyone had
I left the room and I was reflecting on the things I had to do,
So, I felt hungry to eat something, I put all my things away and went to the
I went to eat at the same place I went with the teacher, between
greeting everyone and sat at the same table, after eating I
I headed towards the restaurant's viewing platform and stood there reflecting on
social problems and in that strike that was taking place two days ago
gestating.

I understood the general problem of the population but I couldn't
understand each person's personal problem, and of course he understood
that if people did not identify with a group they entered into conflict
existential, and that was evident to me, because the loneliness that there was
lived invited to belong to something, something that had not yet been known
but I felt that it belonged to his eyes, it belonged to his gaze but it was
something intimate and not something plural, this led me to reflect on how the
People build their lives under certain rules and conditions to
belong to a much larger group, then I remembered Laclau,
an Argentine philosopher who tried to explain what populism is, and he arrives
to the conclusion that populism is a political logic through which
which a "people" antagonistic to the elites is built, this people
seen as a political subject. Then society is made of

Machine Translated by Google

various political subjects, which can be cities and within these in smaller groups, political subjects intertwining with each other the others. Suddenly I heard my name nearby and but distant, I turned my head and it was the teacher I got up from that bench, and I shook his hand, ways to the exit, and he asked me About today's class, I answered that it was an interesting class, but that Science had not reached its end, as Karl Popper said, there was no 100% reliability in science. He told me that science

It was determined to certain groups that clearly wanted it to be a objective science but that was not possible. I came into conflict because For me, science was something objective and then I told him:

- **Science is no longer subordinate to man, or a single interest, but multiple interests. With the development of technology, everything Scientific development is subordinated to the objectivity of development that is something that can no longer be hidden, and this has 2 consequences: 1. The recovery of the human condition and 2. The end of political agendas. This happens with the first shock, the creation of bitcoin, where it was seen that the perceived value was more important than the reliability of the reserve banks, and then with the second shock, the creation of AIs where the People have access to objective knowledge that is not biased by a government (there are many details here, but they can be compared answers, hidden revolutions in the management of AI in disadvantaged countries, creating apps that work**

Machine Translated by Google

With self-installed VPNs there are many ways for the internet to
It is no man's land as Elon Musk demonstrated, where everything is
can hack and even use Starlink satellites. This
This topic should not interest us much because they are details that
(it means) And a third shock, with the creation of the
quantum computers, where the study of all reality
remains open to humans.

He kept thinking about what I told him, he didn't say anything maybe because
There were a lot of people trying to get out of college, he told me that
I lived near the university in the Plaza de San José, when I heard
That name, I felt I should tell him about the girl who spoke
in the afternoons, then upon hearing my interaction with her, he said that
I had never seen her before, but today might be a great day to see her.
So, we headed to the plaza when we arrived it was 2:25 PM
We sat on a bench in front of a temple and with a tree that
She protected us from the sun. She mentions that she always arrived at 4:00
pm, he asked me about the possibility of a third war
world, because at that time the US was launching missiles at Iran to
defend Jerusalem, and in Ukraine there was an invasion from Russia.

Calmly and indifferently he replied:

- Honestly, people already live in a war with themselves.
themselves and I don't think that human beings want to lose their lives
that way. Why is human beings not aware of the

Machine Translated by Google

death until he is about to press "the red button", he will look for a new way of understanding the world and the value of "truth" In the sense I am speaking of, it will be sought after and I hope that it will be find. Not a truth, without knowledge of what it is, but a knowledge of truth as something that happens in the man.

And in fact the reason why science has destroyed this truth and have developed different ideologies based on the destruction of an epistemology of supposedly truths universal for them. This gives us a magnifying glass to study the difference between consciousness itself and consciousness of something (intentionality). Study and explain the origin of this difference in code, understand and explain the origin of that difference, understand the nature of consciousness, and the origin of it comprehension.

As a consequence, see also why the violent nature in the human and everything that he himself does not know about himself, and how this has led him towards something that he has had to justify with policies public, ideology and mobilizations.

The teacher stayed listening calmly to what was being said. affirming, he did not make any face of affirmation or denial, he He kept going. Then he replied saying:

- Mark Antony. If science is subject to objectivity, then it is free from man. And if science is free, it turns out that Man is subordinate to her. This is the idea that women have

Machine Translated by Google

people in the United States. If this idea is true, the
Human management had to be transferred to science and taken away from man,
for example, through AI. From a moral point of view, it is
a frightening idea, since the management of objective science does not
has qualitative parameters and doesn't give a damn about the issues
humans, humans who can be suppressed, exploited or annihilated
if objectivity dictates it. That's late capitalism, but
so was Soviet communism and Nazism. On the
The Internet has owners, they are the owners of the corporations
communication that have sustained and sustain the war in
Ukraine on the basis of controlling global public opinion. And
It is precisely their owners who are pleased that we, who
We are your objectivity, we believe that we are free on your internet.

He had a good point and a solid foundation for the creation of his
argument, with historical facts and assumptions that at that time
I didn't question it, however, there was a kind of bias in his
thinking about science, but a science made by the
Americans, and of course I understood the difference between the philosophers of the
Analytic current and philosophers of the continental current, a dispute
which had taken a long time to show substantial differences.
Then I asked him about the truth itself and he replied:

- Yes, it could be. Although my opinion is adverse, there would be certain
general things that the average public would take for granted. In a
audience, as Saint Paul knew well in the letter to the Ephesians or
To Timothy, I don't remember, what it's about is not that you say the

Machine Translated by Google

truth, but they, the audience, who generally think know little, know that you can do things that almost certainly they will not be able to do.

Then he continued saying:

- In a way, it's a very fun way to "smash the "red button" and entertain you for years from the limitations of the others, which seems cruel, but it's still very funny and not you don't hurt anyone.

Stuart Mill on the other hand... Ask the Hindus how they feel about It was with the application of his books, particularly that ode to the naivety that is the treatise On Liberty.

I knew that in India there was a struggle for independence, In fact, India was one of the last countries to achieve its independence, there was an intense struggle with the United Kingdom and of course Stuart Mill had given examples showing India and the consequences of not adapting liberalism to colonized countries. Or Until now that was what I understood, the teacher asked me if I agreed with what I answered;

- The truth sets people free from what they believe they are, from what they who they think they can become and what they are for others others. The internet is no man's land, Google, it is true that only recognizes and makes certain pages work however, it does not It is the only search engine, although Google tries to monopolize, There is a kind of rebellion, the same thing that happened with Microsoft, for

Machine Translated by Google

That's why the state took Bill Gates to court and then Zuckerberg already many others because it is something that exceeds regulatory control, This is clearly seen in the trial of Swartz, released more than 4 million documents and research JSTOR, a magazine which is very elitist and which Obviously, the vast majority of Peruvian universities do not have access. So it is true that regarding the perception of freedom On the Internet, algorithms are like our restaurant. favorite and they always bring us the same dish, but the truth is It also frees us from conditioning, the text "on the Mill's "freedom" is interesting, of course, it was not written for them, and it is a book that is criticized for defending the Western world and their values. Your analysis is interesting; I hadn't seen that detail, India's problem is overpopulation and inequality, forced labor, among other things that the liberal thinking promotes, but why isn't it like China? There must be an element beyond the cultural and social that make that difference.

The teacher became more serious and said:

- "The truth sets people free." I don't believe that, unless you talk about religion. Only the wise have knowledge but the Most people have to work to live, and that's worth it. for career philosophers. NI Kant, who worked as teacher, was free to miss work.

Machine Translated by Google

"The internet is no man's land." It's the land of the one who pays for it. It is a moral sphere, it is a technological facility with a price and some owners. It's like saying that shoes are a no-man's-land. You don't even believe it yourself.

So I also wanted to defend my position and said:

- Freedom does not eliminate responsibility, it transforms it into goals.

Every programming language is exact and the same; if you can understand that language, the internet doesn't belong to anyone. The internet doesn't belongs to no one because it can belong to everyone. And access to that power It is in the knowledge of the language that constructs it. He replied:

- "So it is true that about the perception of freedom in The internet, algorithms are like our favorite restaurant and They always bring us the same dish, but the truth is that we also frees from conditioning." It is exactly the opposite. The algorithm examines your trends and then sells them to you.

Then I suddenly said:

- If he always orders green noodles and one day you realize that You always order green noodles, you try to eat something else because you realize that you can change, if the algorithm always tells you presents the same or related video is that you are conditioned to it, but by "realizing that you can change" the

Machine Translated by Google

algorithm changes and changes until the algorithm no longer can predict what you are going to see, or buy and so on.

He suddenly changed the subject and said:

- **"India's problem is overpopulation and inequality". In 1780 India was much richer and more populous and just as unequal as England. Peru was richer than a country middle of Europe. We need to know more history.**

Then in that bravery of the afternoon I mentioned:

- **The problem of England's submission to the India achieved its independence in 1947. It is normal that when countries accept the thought of liberalism social (Mill) have freedom of thought, expression, vote feminine, ideas such as public education, protection of the most vulnerable which in the case of India was necessary for there was independence, and as the population in India utilitarianism was always considered the best idea to be could apply, greater good for the greatest number of people.**

It had been a long time since we had been sitting but there was a feeling of debate between two people with different perspectives, then he mentioned:

- **Inequality is an a priori of societies. It is inevitable, because we are not molecules or industrial products. And in In the United States, % of the population has more than half of**

Machine Translated by Google

all the wealth. What is unfortunate is that this 1% is a

a group of psychotics, suicidal people and drug addicts.

Then I mentioned:

- The perceived inequality because if we lived in India like

one more we would not realize the wealth in other countries, or

in countries like North Korea. Even Americans have

a perceived inequality between them, depending on their context. And the

The origin of this inequality that Rousseau mentioned was the

private property, it belongs to me and it belongs to the first person who said this.

convinced everyone that it was so. And analyzing only this constitutes

a deep analysis of the study of an a priori in the human being

not in societies although it manifests itself in them.

Then he said something profound that I had to think about carefully:

- When you mentioned that "There must be an element beyond

the cultural and social that marks that difference." If that element

exists, then inequality is necessary and equality is

undesirable, or it is the other way around, that element is democratic and the

freedom should be prohibited so that it does not affect equality.

This caused in me a deep reflection on freedom, a

freedom that many consider social, but I understood freedom

as something that is in man free from all conditioning

social, emotional and psychological that you may have, for this reason try

He explains that there had to be something beyond the social and cultural

made people free and different, and of course that caused in me a

profound answer that I didn't think to give and I said:

Machine Translated by Google

- This constitutes a deep analysis of the study of an a priori in human beings, not in societies, although it manifests itself in they, I suggest that this element is not natural, that it invites to think that equality is undesirable, and it is not either democratic or universal because that affects the freedom of the people wanting to be different, I suggest that that element It comes from the unconscious of man that manifests itself in his form of life that is seen in modernity.

He stood up and extended his hand and told me he had to go, shake it. his hand and I saw him slowly moving away, at that time I took out the cell phone, like someone trying to occupy their mind, and I saw that they had already After 4:00 pm, that young woman did not appear anywhere. place, nobody was waiting for her either, only me, I stayed waiting approximately 10 more minutes and when I play the fifth bell of the I realized late that I had to leave, I got up, got ready to leave and so I headed to where he lived.

The walls were green with a light, slightly gray hue, That afternoon when the sun was setting, I saw how it changed to a color slightly white, then I closed my eyes from tiredness and stayed absolutely asleep for 4 hours, although I could remember my dreams normally, that afternoon I couldn't remember anything, then I woke up with a special energy, I wanted to do all the jobs

Machine Translated by Google

from the university, the truth was that I had not put interest in my studies, I never felt understood by people, it was like always be different, I knew I had a very good memory and sometimes He was brilliant with the answers he gave, but over time I It shattered life, it was as if I didn't belong to the world and it ruined my life because I was in it, with the passage of time I adapted and molding myself, of course always aware of the mold and that it does not really consumed me, but when I saw her eyes, she woke me up Something I couldn't understand, awakened a fire I hadn't experienced long ago. That night I finished with all the pending activities and I fell asleep on the desk. When I Levante had to go to university, but he didn't see it as necessary, just I had to make an excuse to develop my theory and I also had to worry about money, which didn't matter to me except now that this was my last semester, so I kept thinking about the Things that I had to solve, suddenly memories of me came to me childhood and although the first years of my life I did not consider myself clever, and when I grew up I acted like a fool, because fools always are accepted by others and I had noticed that, I knew what deep within me that I could realize everything but at the same time avoided doing it, it was as if my senses but above all understanding were expanded and I could know any answer they asked me.

Then my cell phone rang, I got up from my chair and left my room. my mother telling me that she would come to see me soon.

Machine Translated by Google

The day was relatively quiet, the same people being or
trying to be themselves, this time the teacher was different
like when you discover something that was always right in front of your eyes,
that deep, confused and accurate look, with a more
Slowly, feeling the words being said, I knew something was up.
past, I didn't know what, but something was happening. The professor gave his class
Continuing with the learning scheme, at the end he called me for
my name and told me that the young woman he was talking about gave him a
letter to me, I got excited and asked him about it, and he told me that
read the letter I didn't have much to say, it's like that feeling of
discomfort for wanting to answer a question, then I walked away and
I tried to say goodbye, when suddenly he came to and told me that such
Maybe it was good to eat something after studying. I replied that I always
It's good to eat something. Then we walked again to that
campus restaurant, he asks me what I was planning with my life, why
that the philosophy degree didn't pay well, and we had to get something
live, then I answered that it is from technology, and that this one does not have
owner and since there is no owner, it was possible to grow in that way, either by selling
something or offering a service, he replied to what I said, mentioning that the
The Internet was a controllable place. So I said:

- **Any system can be hacked but it is not done by**
  decency or because it is not worth it, I mean there is no
  a centralized body that does not allow you access to the
  programming language that the internet is built on,
  Operating systems like Windows have non-standard code.

Machine Translated by Google

documented or extremely complex, this means that

There is no such thing as perfect security.

He replied:

- Every programming language is exact. It always says what the programmer wants or seeks. A program does not have intentionality and cannot search for anything on its own
I always watch bullfights. Why does the internet bother me?
always presented scenes of animal annihilation, scenes of
wild beasts devouring people, torture of animals in the jungle, etc.?
Could it be because in bullfights it is the same thing as
when a crocodile swallows a goat? Or is it that the
algorithm, with its objective intelligence, does not understand what I am looking for
and wants to impose something disgusting on me?

Here I remembered the Facebook trial, where the judge complains about the videos that come out, and the owner has to explain how the algorithms
They adapt to the videos we watch the most, at that time I didn't want to respond more, because I remembered that it is better to be silent and not discuss imposing an idea that no matter how true it is,
Besides, I was thinking about the letter more than ever, and I didn't understand how they both got to know each other. Then I asked him:

- How did you meet her?

He remained silent, I realized the discomfort he felt,
I didn't say anything and changed the subject and answered her question.
inequality. and I said:

Machine Translated by Google

- If we think that inequality is natural (biological, social, etc.)
equality is not possible. If we think that inequality is
universal or democratic, people cease to be free.
The point is that if we think about the origin of their
inequalities through these two key pathways come into conflict
because these are two important principles for society.

He remained silent, he knew there was something in that letter that had caused astonishment in the professor. He remained strong to talk about her. Then I stopped insisting and said goodbye, went to the park where I saw her, I sat on that bench in front of the temple, I opened the letter and He said:

Hello, I know you were looking for me, we talked about you with your teacher and He told me his impression of you, you are like a lighthouse that doesn't want to light up but it's still on, I know you wanted to see me and listen more often, but when you remember my eyes, remember my gaze you will be with me, you will be here in front of me, and I will be in front yours.

Sincerely, Wake up.

That afternoon I approached the edge of the city, I saw in front of me a orange sunset and how the sun was setting slowly, little by little The sky changed color to fuchsia, yellow, red and finally night

Machine Translated by Google

made his entrance, the stars showed themselves, they appeared one by one as if saying I am here always here, and I looked at his eyes in those stars, then it started to rain from the inside out, I leaned on the railings that separated the sea from the city and in the darkness A young man was seen resting with his head resting on the railing.

The next day I woke up tired, I dreamed that a voice told me, already Enough, wake up, wake up. Then I understood that I had to start from new. I had to stop deceiving myself and stop thinking that I am a genius, I had to leave all my projects behind and worry for something I didn't fully understand yet, so I stopped doing those things that took up all my time and then I walked towards the shore of that beach I was slowly approaching the edge of the dry sand and suddenly I felt his hand touch mine, suddenly there was understood everything.

It was a normal morning, I was studying at the university and Amanda was My girlfriend at that time, we both studied at the same school career, we both had the idea of being speakers and traveling to different places in the world to give lectures, however, that one Tomorrow we meet the professor, that correct man who He loved learning new things and talking about philosophy with his students, So that morning we went to that horizon to talk about philosophy and while we were walking along the shore a car derailed, the next day The next thing I woke up and my days were grayer but with a certain

Machine Translated by Google

forgetting things and greater presence in the present, it was as if the present had a hypnotic factor in me, which did not allow me to see the world objectively, and the paradox of this is that when I look at the world with objectivity as I now live the present. I realized also that we all identify with, admire, are impressed by, people who will not exist in 200 years, we do not see their illusory existence, we rather see its present as permanence.

Then I walked beside her and suddenly I felt like I was short of breath, and that I fainted in a position where I remained asleep, and Suddenly I let myself be carried away by that light until it disappeared and I said: Christ I love you and I woke up.